



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/608,976	06/30/2000	Douglas P. Brown	NCRC-0012-US(9020)	1448
26890	7590	01/21/2004	EXAMINER	
JAMES M. STOVER			CHEN, TE Y	
NCR CORPORATION			ART UNIT	
1700 SOUTH PATTERSON BLVD, WHQ4			PAPER NUMBER	
DAYTON, OH 45479			2171	

DATE MAILED: 01/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**Application No.  
**09/608,976**Applicant(s)  
**Brown et al.**Examiner  
**Susan Chen**Art Unit  
**2171**

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED Dec 16, 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid the abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**THE PERIOD FOR REPLY [check only a) or b)]**

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
Please refer to the attached Appendix.

6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☒ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) rejected: 1-27 and 29-41

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner

9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 2171

## APPENDIX

Applicant's arguments filed on 12/16/2003 have been fully considered, however, the arguments have not been found persuasive.

In order to help applicant appreciate that the prior art on record including Hallmark, Macleod and Reiner, disclose the features as claimed by applicant, applicant's attention is directed to mappings provided in previous office actions, and specifically the following citations:

Hallmark: col. 5, lines 39-42 having the statements as following:

"One method of representing an execution plan is a row source tree. At execution, traversal of a row source tree from the bottom up yields a sequence of steps for performing the operation(s) specified by the SQL statement."

Furthermore, Hallmark: col. 6, lines 23-54 having the statements as following:

"Query Coordinator (QC) assumes control of the processing of a query. The QC can also execute row sources that are to be executed serially. Additional threads of control are associated with the QC for the duration of the parallel execution of a query. Each of these threads is called a Query Server (QS). Each QS executes a parallel operator and processes a subset of the entire set of data, and produces a subset of the output data. The parallel operators that are executed by a QS are called data flow operators (DFOs)..."

Based on the above statement, Hallmark definitely disclose a query plan can be represented by a row source tree and executed parallel in a database system.

Hallmark did not specifically disclose displaying and depicting the parallel query executing steps and plural elements on a graphic user interface (GUI).

Art Unit: 2171

However, MacLeod disclosed a query execution plan can be displayed and depicted in form of a tree structure with statistics information to reveal a plurality of steps and elements participated in either single query processing node [e.g. Fig. 5] or multiple parallel query processing nodes [e.g. Fig. 6; col. 8, line 29 - col. 9, line 4] via a graphic user interface (GUI) [e.g., Fig.(s) 5-10, col. 5, line 60 - col. 10, line 6, specifically col. 7, line 43 - col. 8, line 6]. Macleod further disclosed that the detailed statistics information represent the selected physical operation steps, logical query operators corresponding to the physical operation step, the output results by the operation, the expect cost I/O activity, CPU activity, the predicates and parameters used by the query [e.g., col. 9, lines 35-50]. Thus, in contrary to applicant's argument, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, with the teachings of Hallmark and Macleod in front of him/her, would definitely being motivated to combined the teachings of Hallmark and Macleod to developed a successful combined system as claimed by applicant, because by doing so, the combined system will provide a user-friendly GUI facility which would allow a user to optimize a query in a massively parallel system and to pop up multiple display screens illustrating multiple execution query plans as well as the associated plurality of elements so that the user may select the most desirable.

The rest of arguments rehash issues already addressed on record. As such, the examiner maintain the same rejections as cited in previous office actions.